



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,115	01/27/2004	Mats Anders Engwall	NIKOP034/PA414 00/04624	3152
22434	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER GUTIERREZ, KEVIN C	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT 2851	
			PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

21

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/766,115	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ENGWALL, MATS ANDERS	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kevin Gutierrez	<b>Art Unit</b> 2851	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☒ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the quantity of words exceeds 150. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Although, applicant suggests (page 12, last paragraph) to utilize or incorporate the invention of figures 4 and 5 in apparatus and methods described with reference to figures 1-3, applicant does not describe the manner in which it being incorporated as defined in claims 9-32.

### *Drawings*

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: references 52 and 54 (page 4, lines 24-25, two electromagnetic motors).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

5. Applicant must submit formal drawings of Figures 4 and 5 due to the obscure appearance of the present invention.

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, an embodiment having a reticle stage, a working stage, and a drive stage (claim 9) and an embodiment having a "wafer table placed on said drive stage and arranged to retain a reticle" (claim 17) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

7. Claims 9-32 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. Claim 9, page 15, line 17 - "said drive stage" lacks proper antecedent basis. In view of the specification, it appears that the drive stage is the working stage. Hence, "drive" should be replaced with --working-- to provide proper antecedent basis for the claim's terminology.
- b. Claim 17, page 18, line 1, - "said drive stage" lacks proper antecedent basis. It appears that "drive" should be replaced with --reticle-- to have proper antecedent basis. Please note that if "said drive stage" is the reticle stage, there is no antecedent basis in the specification for a wafer/reticle table to be placed on the reticle stage. The drawings also do not show this feature.
- c. Claims 25 and 26 are objected to as being an improper dependent claim. The claims are directed to an object manufactured with the system of claims 9 and 17, respectively. However, it is conceivable that the object can be manufactured by another system other than the system of claim 9 or 17. For example, the object can be manufactured by another system such as an ink jet printer. Hence, the claims do not further limit claim 9 and 17, respectively, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph.
- d. Claims 27 and 28 are objected to as being an improper dependent claim. The claims are directed to a wafer on which an image has been formed by the system of claims 9 and 17, respectively. However, it is conceivable that the image on the wafer can be formed by another system other than the system of claim 9 or 17. For example, the image on the wafer can be formed by another

system such as an ink jet printer. Hence, the claims do not further limit claim 9 and 17, respectively, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph.

e. The remaining claims are also objected to due to their dependencies to one of the above objected claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 1-8 allowed.
9. Claims 9-32 would be allowable if amended to overcome the above objections.
10. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art does not teach or disclose a planar elongated member with one end portion extending in said longitudinal direction and the opposite end portion attached to and wound around said shaft, said elongated member being made of an elastic material and having a naturally arcuate sectional shape in said transverse direction and a plurality of conduits each attached to said one end portion of said elongated member to said table at one end.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

*Conclusion*

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jacobs et al (US6,815,699) disclose a mechanical limiter that limits rotation of substrate and Hazelton (US 6,903,467) discloses a tube carrier assembly.

12. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

The specification, drawings, and claim objections (see above) must be addressed.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Gutierrez whose telephone number is (571)-272-5922. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 7:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571)-272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin Gutierrez  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2851

June 22, 2005

  
**JUDY NGUYEN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**